

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the final Office Action mailed July 19, 2006.

Claims 1-11 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging acceptance of the Drawings filed with this application.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Novakov, US Patent No. 6,571,103. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Among the problems recognized and solved by applicant's claimed invention is that of managing a power saving mode in a mobile terminal when a base station receives a physical address inquiry packet addressed to the mobile terminal. According to an aspect of applicant's claimed invention, the base station can respond to the physical address inquiry packet received acting as an agent on behalf of the mobile terminal.

For at least the following reasons, applicant's claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious from the cited art. By way of example, independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 require responding to the physical address inquiry packet as an agent for the mobile terminal to solve the physical address inquiry, when the packet concerning the physical address inquiry is found.

Novakov discloses establishing a communication link between a telecommunications network and a mobile station via a local station (Novakov, Abstract), for example using communication protocol establishing a piconet between the local station 10 acting as a master and the mobile station 26 acting as a slave according to the Bluetooth standard (Novakov, column 5, lines 24-28). Novakov discloses that the local station 10 sends an activation code to the mobile station 26 which eventually causes the mobile station to end its power saving mode and to resume an active or working mode of operation (Novakov, column 7, lines 29-34; Fig. 2).

Novakov does not disclose or suggest a base station finding a packet concerning a physical address inquiry, as required by independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9. As discussed, Novakov discloses establishing a piconet between the local station and the mobile stations, however, it is silent as to the processing or the finding of this type of packet at the base station (or at an external control unit connected to the base station, per claim 2, or the like).

Further, since Novakov does not disclose or suggest finding or processing such a packet at the base station, Novakov is incapable of disclosing or suggesting responding by the base station (or by the external control unit connected to the base station, per claim 2, or the like) to the packet concerning the physical address inquiry as an agent for the mobile terminal to solve the physical address inquiry, as further required by independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9.

The Examiner alleges that inquiry messages sent by the local station 10 (steps 50A, 50B . . . 50X) in regular time intervals in order to find and identify the mobile station 26 within range of the Bluetooth link correspond to the packet concerning physical address inquiry (Office Action, page 8). First, it is noted that Novakov discloses that these inquiry messages are sent by the local station 10, and not received from a communication line from an external source addressed to the mobile terminal and found by the base station.

Second, there is no disclosure in Novakov that the inquiry messages sent by the local station are responded to by the local station to resolve or solve the physical address inquiry for the requesting party. In fact, Novakov discloses that these inquiry messages are wake-up messages designed to return the mobile station to working mode. By contrast, according to an aspect of applicant's claimed invention, the base station, instead of switching the mobile station to normal or non-power saving mode, responds to the packets concerning physical address inquiry as an agent for the mobile terminal. Thus, Novakov does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9.

Moreover, Novakov does not disclose or suggest the problems recognized and solved by applicant's claimed invention, and thus does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9. For example, Novakov does not disclose or suggest the problem of managing a power saving mode in a mobile terminal when a base station receives a physical address inquiry packet addressed to the mobile terminal. Thus, independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 would not have been obvious based on Novakov.

In view of the foregoing discussion, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested, and allowance of the claims of the application is believed to be warranted. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present Amendment or regarding the application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-provided telephone number.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON OCTOBER 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700